REMARKS

After entry of the above amendments, claims 1-44 will be pending in the above-identified application. New claims 28-44 correspond to some of the original claims and are supported in the specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-12

Claims 1, 6, and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Mastering Microsoft Office 97" by Moseley et al.

The Office action states:

> Re claim 1, Moseley discloses providing said data of an information record to a consumer, (fig. 33.1 is a table contains plurality of records, pages 757); and updating a history table, (fig. 33.1 allows the user or consumer to delete and to sort the records file, page 757).
> Moseley discloses history table, (fig. 33.1), but Moseley does not clearly disclose comprising a message state field, said updating comprising setting said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data. However, Moseley discloses an inbox, which allows the users to view the contents of the inbox folder. When the user want to read an e-mail message, the user just double-click on it to open the message to read its full content. The envelopes opened indicate the record has been read, and the envelopes closed indicate the record has not been read, (see fig. 33.1). Thus, Moseley teaches said message state field in history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the taught, so the users know which message that the users have been read and which message that users have not been read. In this way, it save the users or consumers a lot of time.

(March 31, 2003 Office action, pgs. 2-3).

Moseley discloses:

> When you install Office 97, the Inbox icon that was previously on your desktop is replaced with a shortcut to Outlook. Double-click on the Microsoft Outlook desktop shortcut or select Start ▶ Programs ▶ Microsoft Outlook from the Taskbar. If you get a Choose Profile dialog box, select your profile or accept the default profile if no other profiles exist (profiles are discussed in Chapter 37). When Outlook starts, the Office Assistant appears offering a number of introductory help topics; click on OK to close the Assistant for now.
> Outlook lets you manage your major tasks using a single window from which other windows can be opened when necessary. This window, known as the Information Viewer, can contain several sections, including the Inbox folder (see Figure 33.1). To the left of the

window is the Outlook Bar, showing command icons that help you navigate your way
through the program. Above the Information Viewer is the Folder List button, which, when
pressed, displays the list of Outlook folders.

(Moseley, pg. 757).

The cited passage, however, only discusses what a user sees in the Outlook window. In addition, Fig.
33.1 of Moseley merely shows a view of the Inbox folder in the Outlook window. Furthermore, in claim 1, a
history record is distinct from an information record. Moseley does not teach or suggest a history record that
is distinct from an information record. Therefore, Moseley does not disclose or suggest "updating a history
table, said history table comprising one or more history records, each said history record comprising a
message state field, said updating comprising setting said message state field in a history record
corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data," as recited in claim 1.

"[U]pdating a history table, said history table comprising one or more history records, each said
history record comprising a message state field, said updating comprising setting said message state field in a
history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data," as recited in
claim 1, is only taught by applicants' own disclosure. Hence, modifying Moseley to include "updating a
history table, said history table comprising one or more history records, each said history record comprising a
message state field, said updating comprising setting said message state field in a history record
corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data" as taught only by applicants'
own disclosure, is impermissible hindsight under M.P.E.P. § 2145.

Accordingly, based at least on the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable
over Moseley. Given that claims 2-12 depend from claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that those claims
are patentable over Moseley for at least the same reasons.

Claims 13-20 and 27

Claims 13-20 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.
Patent No. 6,058,389 to Chandra et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,745 to Itakura et al.

The Office action states:

> Re claim 13, Chandra discloses an information queue (fig. 2 is information queue)
> comprising one or more information queue records (fig. 2 shows queue 1 and queue 2
> records), each said information queue record comprising information to be accessed by one or

more consumer, (col. 7, lines 6-8, each row contains columns that store the message identifier, queue name, queue schema, time in seconds, and a flag indicating whether the time is a delay time or expiration time).

Chandra discloses each said table record comprising an identification of said information in an information queue record, (col. 8, lines 63-66). However, Chandra does not disclose a table separated from said information queue comprising one or more table records, each said table record further comprising a consumer identification field comprising an identification of one of said one or more consumer.

However, Itakura teaches a table (fig. 7) separated from said information queue comprising one or more table records (fig. 7, the table contains plurality of records, items XXX, AAA, AND OOO), each said table record further comprising a consumer identification field (fig. 7, MESSAGE USER PASSWORD field) comprising an identification of one of said one or more consumer (fig. 7, the ID and password of each message user).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chandra with the teaching of Itakura because when a user requests a message, the user's characteristics are read out from the user database based on a user ID for identifying the user. In this way, the user accesses a message more accurately.

(March 31, 2003 Office action, pgs. 9-10).

Chandra discloses:

Each queue table 200 can contain multiple queues 202, 204 each having multiple queue messages 208.

(Col. 7, ll. 6-8).

Chandra further discloses:

Each row contains columns that store the message identifier, queue name, queue schema, time in seconds, and a flag indicating whether the time is a delay time or expiration time.

(Col. 8, ll. 63-66).

Chandra, however, does not disclose or suggest "a table separated from said information queue comprising one or more table records, each said table record comprising an identification of said information in an information queue record, each said table record further comprising a consumer identification field comprising an identification of one of said one or more consumers" as recited in claim 13.

Itakura does not cure the deficiencies of Chandra. Itakura discloses:

> FIGS. 7 and 8 show the construction of the message user database 34 of FIG. 6. The message user database 34 stores the ID and password for each message user, Internet provider IDs for identifying the respective information providers 20, and a user ID (Internet provider's user ID) assigned to each user by an Internet provider and used when the user accesses Internet through that Internet provider. The message user database 34 also has, for each message display period, information about the user (user information) such as date of birth 312, sex 314, marital status 316, occupation 318, and address 320.

(Col. 9, ll. 55-65).

Itakura, however, does not disclose or suggest "a table separated from said information queue comprising one or more table records, each said table record comprising an identification of said information in an information queue record, each said table record further comprising a consumer identification field comprising an identification of one of said one or more consumers" as recited in claim 13. In particular, Itakura does not disclose an information queue nor does it disclose the message user database 34 as having an identification of information in an information queue record.

Therefore, even if Chandra and Itakura were combined, the combination neither teaches nor suggests "a table separated from said information queue comprising one or more table records, each said table record comprising an identification of said information in an information queue record, each said table record further comprising a consumer identification field comprising an identification of one of said one or more consumers" as recited in claim 13. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is patentable over Chandra in view of Itakura based at least on the reasons discussed above. Given that claims 14-20 and 27 depend from claim 13, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are patentable over Chandra in view of Itakura for at least the same reasons.

Claims 21-22

Claims 21-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandra in view of Itakura.

The Office action states:

> Re claim 21, Chandra discloses a message queue, (col. 7, lines 7-8) comprising one or more message queue record (col. 7, lines 4-14), each said one or more message queue records comprising a message and a message identification, (col. 8, lines 63-66). Chandra

discloses each of said one or more history records comprising a message identification (col. 8, lines 63-66), a consumer identification (col. 7, lines 39-40) and a message state identification, (col. 8, lines 63-66, flag indicating whether the time is delay time or expiration time); and one or more work list entries, (col. 10, lines 52-58), each work list entry comprising a message identification, (col. 8, lines 63-66). But Chandra does not teach a history table separated from said message queue and a work list table separated from said message queue and said history table.

However, Itakura teaches a history table separated from said message queue (fig. 7) and a work list table (fig. 7 also a work list table) separated from said message queue and said history table, (col. 9, lines 55-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chandra with the teachings of Itakura so the message providers know the characteristics of the user, such as sex, age, etc.

(March 31, 2003 Office action, pg. 12).

Chandra and Itakura, either alone or in combination, however, do not disclose or suggest "a history table separated from said message queue comprising one or more history records, each of said one or more history records comprising a message identification, a consumer identification and a message state identification" or "a work list table separated from said message queue and said history table comprising one or more work list entries, each said work list entry comprising a message identification" as recited in claim 21. As discussed above with respect to claim 13, Fig. 2 of Chandra only shows a queue table and Fig. 7 of Itakura merely illustrates the structure of the message user database 34.

Accordingly, based at least on the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 21 is patentable over Chandra in view of Itakura. Given that claim 22 depends from claim 21, applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is patentable over Chandra in view of Itakura for at least the same reasons.

Claims 23-26 and 28-44

Claims 23-26 have been indicated as being allowable over the prior art. Given that new claims 28-30 depend from claim 23, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are also allowable over the prior art.

New claims 31 and 38 correspond to original claim 23. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that new claims 31 and 38 are also allowable over the prior art. Given that new claims 32-37 and 39-44 depend from claims 31 and 38, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that those claims are also allowable over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: _6-30-03_

By: _____
Erin C. Ming
Reg. No. 47,797

Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
Telephone: (650) 849-4904
Telefax: (650) 849-4800